arXiv:1409.8479v1 [math.AP] 30 Sep 2014

A GENERALIZED POROUS MEDIUM EQUATION RELATED TO SOME SINGULAR QUASILINEAR PROBLEMS

FRANCESCO PETITTA

Abstract. In this paper we study existence and nonexistence of solutions for a Dirichlet boundary value problem whose model is

$$\begin{cases} -\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \Delta u^m = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a bounded domain of $\mathbb{R}^N$, a_m is a sequence of nonnegative real numbers, and f is in $L^q(\Omega)$, $q > \frac{N}{2}$.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
1.1. Two guide examples 3
2. General assumptions and statement of the main results 5
3. Nonexistence for large data 7
4. Existence of a solution 9
4.1. Existence for small data 11
4.2. Existence in the general case 13
5. Approximating sequences 14
References 15

1. Introduction

Let Ω be a bounded open set of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 1$, let a_m be a sequence of nonnegative real numbers, and consider, as a model, the following

The author has been partially supported by the PNPGC project, references MTM2008–03176.

Dirichlet boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \Delta u^m = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where f is a nonnegative function in $L^q(\Omega)$, $q > \frac{N}{2}$.

This problem contains, at least formally, the features of the so called *filtration equation* or *Generalized Porous Medium Equation* (GPME). The literature about GPME is huge, and we refer to [5] (and the references therein) for a wide account on this topic as well as the main possible applications. Only recall that a filtration equation is, roughly speaking, a problem involving an operator of the type $\Delta\psi(u)$ with $\psi'(s) > 0$.

Although the general case could be definitely taken into account, for the sake of exposition we will only consider positive data f. The reason is twofold; it allows to deal with nonnegative solutions and, on the other hand, it is the right framework for most of the concrete cases.

However, our first motivation in the study of this problem was a purely mathematical one. More precisely, we started from a *formal connection*, in the case $a_m = \frac{1}{m}$, with the following elliptic boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}\left(\dfrac{\nabla v}{1-v}\right) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

studied in [3] (see Example 1 below).

Notice that the fact that the solution should be (strictly) less than 1 for problem (1.2) is, let us say, *structured* in the problem because of the presence of the singularity at $v = 1$. On the other hand, in problem (1.1) this singularity is, in some sense, hidden by the presence of the *infinite sum of nonlinear slow diffusions*. Anyway the singular bound can still be there as we will show later (see Proposition 2.3 below). Just recall that the term *slow diffusion* comes from the fact that, for instance in the model case $a_m \equiv 1$, by trivial computations, we are lead to the following degenerate elliptic operators

$$-\mathrm{div}(mu^{m-1}\nabla u),$$

and the *degenerate coefficient* (and then the diffusion) near $u = 0$ becomes *smaller* for $m > 1$ (and smaller and smaller as m grows).

We will prove both existence and nonexistence results for weak solutions to problem (1.1) depending on the character of the sequence

a_m and in particular on the radius of convergence σ of the associated power series, defined by

$$\limsup_{m\to+\infty} \sqrt[m]{a_m} = \frac{1}{\sigma}, \tag{1.3}$$

where also the extreme cases $\sigma = 0$ and $\sigma = +\infty$ are allowed when the above limit is respectively $+\infty$ or 0. As it will be clear in a while, to have the radius of convergence σ defined as in (1.3) would formally correspond to have a singularity at $v = \sigma$ in an associated singular elliptic problem of the type (1.2).

We will also assume, and this will be essential in our analysis, that infinitely many a_m are different from zero, and that, in particular, $a_1 \neq 0$.

Roughly speaking, we prove nonexistence of a solution in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ if

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \sigma^m < +\infty, \tag{1.4}$$

and the size of the datum is large. In fact, this result can be interpreted as a *formal counterpart* of the results in [3], where the author proved, that, if $h(s) \geq \alpha > 0$ is a continuous function in $[0, \sigma)$, then problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(h(v)\nabla v) = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,, \end{cases}$$

admits a weak solution for any data if

$$H(\sigma) = \int_0^{\sigma} h(s)ds = +\infty\,.$$

On the other hand if (1.4) is not in force we can find a solution for any data. We will also see that a solution to problem (1.1) does exist, no matter of (1.4), if the size of the datum is small enough. Finally notice that the assumption $h(s) \geq \alpha > 0$ in [3] has $a_1 \neq 0$ as a counterpart in our case.

1.1. **Two guide examples.** To better understand the problem let us show what happens in two concrete examples.

Example 1. Consider the following singular elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}\left(\dfrac{\nabla v}{1-v}\right) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.5}$$

In [3] it is proved that, for $f \in L^q(\Omega)$, $q > \frac{N}{2}$, there exists a constant $0 < \theta < 1$ and a nonnegative function $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that v solves

(1.5) in the weak sense and $0 \leq v < \theta$ a.e. on Ω. In other words the solution is not affected by the presence of the singularity. So that we are allowed to expand in power series the term $\frac{1}{1-v}$ in the weak formulation of (1.5) to get

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \int_{\Omega} \nabla v^m \cdot \nabla \varphi = \int_{\Omega} f\varphi,$$

for any $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Notice that the radius of convergence of the power series associated to $a_m = \frac{1}{m}$ is 1 and, obviously,

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m = +\infty.$$

Example 2. Let us now turn our attention to nonnegative solutions for the following singular elliptic problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}((1-\log(1-v))\nabla v) = f & \text{in } \Omega, \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

In [3] it is proved that a weak solution to problem (1.6) does exist if the size of the datum f is small. Let us consider the formal power series of the logarithm for $0 < v < 1$. We are led to

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v - \displaystyle\sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m(m-1)} \Delta v^m = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

Again, if we define $a_1 = 1$ and $a_m = \frac{1}{m(m-1)}$ for $m > 1$, then the radius of convergence of the associated power series is 1 but now

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m < +\infty.$$

We will prove, in Section 3, that problem (1.7) does not admit any weak solution if the size of the datum f (i.e. $\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}$) is large enough.

The plan of the paper is as follows: in the next section we provide our general assumptions and we state the main results by also showing some useful a priori properties of the solutions we are concerned with. In Section 3 we prove the nonexistence result under assumption (1.4) if the size of the datum is large enough. Section 4 will be devoted to the proof of existence of a solution if either (1.4) is not in force or the size of datum f is small enough. Finally, in the last section we study

the behavior of the approximating sequence of solutions when existence (for the limit problem) does not hold.

Notation. In this paper the symbol C, if not explicitly stressed, will denote any positive constant which depends on the data of the problem but never on the solution itself. Moreover, the value of C may change line by line.

2. General assumptions and statement of the main results

Let Ω be a bounded open set of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N \geq 1$. Moreover, let $A : \mathbb{R}^N \mapsto \mathcal{M}^{N\times N}$ be a symmetric matrix satisfying the following standard assumptions: there exist two positive constants $0 < \alpha \leq \beta$ such that

$$\alpha|\xi|^2 \leq A(x)\xi \cdot \xi, \quad \text{a.e. on } \Omega, \forall \xi \in \mathbb{R}^N, \xi \neq 0\,, \tag{2.8}$$

and

$$|A(x)| \leq \beta, \quad \text{a.e. on } \Omega\,. \tag{2.9}$$

We then define

$$A_m(x) := a_m A(x),$$

where $\{a_m\}$ is a sequence of nonnegative real numbers with $a_1 \neq 0$. We also assume that $a_m \neq 0$ for infinitely many $m > 1$. Occasionally, without loss of generality, we shall be allowed to suppose that *all* of the a_m are strictly positive.

We are interested in the following Dirichlet boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\displaystyle\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{div}(A_m(x)\nabla u^m) = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.10}$$

with f a nonnegative function in $L^q(\Omega)$, $q > \frac{N}{2}$. Notice that, if $A(x) = I$, we are led the model problem (1.1).

Let us state what we mean for weak solution to problem (2.10). As suggested by Example 1, the natural way to define it is the following

Definition 2.1. We say that a nonnegative function $u \in H_0^1(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ is a weak solution for problem (2.10) if

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \int_\Omega A_m(x)\nabla u^m \cdot \nabla\varphi = \int_\Omega f\varphi, \tag{2.11}$$

for any $\varphi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

Remark 2.2. Let us observe that, if $m > 1$ and $u \in H^1_0(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, then also u^m is in $H^1_0(\Omega)$, so that all the terms in (2.11) are well defined. The request of boundedness on u is natural since we deal with data f in $L^q(\Omega)$, $q > \frac{N}{2}$ (see [4]).

Also notice that, if $0 \leq u \leq \gamma < \sigma$ (where σ is as in (1.3)), then the left hand side of (2.11) is always finite. Indeed, we have

$$\left|\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \int_\Omega A_m(x)\nabla u^m \cdot \nabla\varphi\right|$$
$$= \left|\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m \int_\Omega A_m(x) u^{m-1}\nabla u \cdot \nabla\varphi\right| \leq \beta \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m m\gamma^{m-1} \int_\Omega |\nabla u \cdot \nabla\varphi|$$

$$\leq C \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m m\gamma^{m-1} < +\infty.$$

On the other hand, as a peculiarity of these problem we notice that a solution in $H^1_0(\Omega)$ is not expected to exist with $\mathrm{meas}(\{u > \sigma\}) > 0$. More precisely we have

Proposition 2.3. *Let $f \in L^q(\Omega)$, $q > \frac{N}{2}$ be a nonnegative function. Then any weak solution of (2.10) satisfies*

$$0 \leq u \leq \sigma \quad \textit{a.e. on } \Omega\,.$$

Thanks to the previous result we have a precise picture of the situation which is summarized in the result below

Theorem 2.4. *Let $0 \leq \sigma \leq \infty$. Then a weak solution to problem (2.10) does exist for any $f \in L^q(\Omega)$, $q > \frac{N}{2}$, if and only if*

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \sigma^m = +\infty \tag{2.12}$$

Remark 2.5. Some considerations are in order to be done about the two extreme cases $\sigma = 0$ and $\sigma = +\infty$. Proposition 2.3 allows us to say, in the particular case $\sigma = 0$ (where (2.12) always fails), that any weak solution of problem (2.10) turns out to be 0 a.e. on Ω. So that, no nontrivial solutions are allowed in this case. On the other hand, in the limit case $\sigma = +\infty$ (where (2.12) is trivially satisfied) the situation is simpler and, as we will see, the existence of a solution can be proved.

The proof of Theorem 2.4 will be a consequence of the two results below. In order to state the nonexistence result it will be useful to

consider an slightly different problem. That is, for fixed $\lambda > 0$, we consider

$$\begin{cases} -\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{div}(A_m(x)\nabla u^m) = \lambda f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.13}$$

with f a nonnegative function in $L^q(\Omega)$, $q > \frac{N}{2}$ such that $f \not\equiv 0$.

Theorem 2.6. *Let*

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \sigma^m < +\infty.$$

Then there exists a positive number Λ_f, such that problem (2.13) does not admit any weak solution if $\lambda > \Lambda_f$.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $f \in L^q(\Omega)$, $q > \frac{N}{2}$, and $\{a_m\}$ such that condition (2.12) is in force with $0 < \sigma \leq \infty$. Then there exists a weak solution for problem (2.10).*

3. Nonexistence for large data

Let us start this section by proving Proposition 2.3.

Proof of Proposition 2.3. Let u be a weak solution to problem (2.10). The solution is nonnegative by definition. We want to show that $u \leq \sigma$.

We use u (2.11), we drop all the positive terms but the first one to get, using (2.8), Hölder and Sobolev inequalities,

$$\|u\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq C\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)},$$

where the constant C only depends on α, a_1 and $|\Omega|$.

On the other hand, again by choosing u as test function, we now drop all the positive terms but the n-th, to get, reasoning as before and using the previous inequality

$$a_n n \int_{\Omega} u^{n-1}|\nabla u|^2 \leq C\|f\|^2_{L^q(\Omega)}.$$

Now, for fixed $M > \sigma$, we have

$$\int_{\Omega} u^{n-1}|\nabla u|^2 \geq M^{n-1} \int_{\{u \geq M\}} |\nabla u|^2,$$

so that, for infinitely many n, we have

$$\int_{\{u \geq M\}} |\nabla u|^2 \leq C\frac{\|f\|^2_{L^q(\Omega)}}{n a_n M^n},$$

which implies, using the definition of σ and taking the liminf as n goes to infinity, $u \leq M$, a.e. Due to the arbitrary choice of M we get $0 \leq u \leq \sigma$ a.e. on Ω.

□

Let us turn now to our nonexistence result. We are in position to prove Theorem 2.6. We define

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \sigma^m := K < \infty. \tag{3.14}$$

Let us also recall that, for $f \in L^q(\Omega)$ with $q > \frac{N}{2}$, and $f \not\equiv 0$, is possible to define (see for instance [2] for further details) the first positive eigenvalue $\lambda_1(A, f)$ of the weighted eigenvalue boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(A(x)\nabla\varphi) = \lambda\, f\, \varphi & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \varphi = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

as

$$\lambda_1(A, f) := \inf_{\substack{v \in H_0^1(\Omega) \\ v \neq 0}} \frac{\int_\Omega A(x)\nabla v \cdot \nabla v}{\int_\Omega f\, v^2}\,. \tag{3.15}$$

Moreover, the infimum is attained by a positive eigenfunction $\varphi_1(A, f)$ which also solves the associated Euler-Lagrange equation.

We will use $\lambda_1(A, f)$ and $\varphi_1(A, f)$ (or, to simplify the notation, $\lambda_1(f)$ and $\varphi_1(f)$) to prove *one side* of Theorem 2.4 (i.e. Theorem 2.6).

Proof of Theorem 2.6. Suppose by contradiction that a solution u to problem (2.13) does exist for any $\lambda > 0$. We take $\varphi_1(f)$ as test function for (2.13) and we get

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \int_\Omega A(x)\nabla u^m \cdot \nabla\varphi_1(f) = \lambda \int_\Omega f\varphi_1(f),$$

so that by definition, recalling that $A(x)$ is symmetric, we have

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \lambda_1(f) \int_\Omega f\varphi_1(f) u^m = \lambda \int_\Omega f\varphi_1(f).$$

Since $0 \le u \le \sigma$ by Proposition 2.3, we can write

$$\lambda \int_\Omega f\varphi_1(f) = \lambda_1(f) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \int_\Omega a_m u^m f\varphi_1$$

$$\le \lambda_1(f) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \int_\Omega a_m \sigma^m f\varphi_1(f) = K\lambda_1(f) \int_\Omega f\varphi_1(f)$$

which yields

$$(\lambda - K\lambda_1(f)) \le 0\,,$$

a contradiction if $\lambda > K\lambda_1(f)$. □

Remark 3.1. Let us come back to problem (2.10) with a general datum $f \in L^q(\Omega)$, $q > \frac{N}{2}$ and a_m satisfying (3.14). The range of nonexistence proven above can be explicitly characterized in terms of the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1(A, f)$. In fact, starting from the condition on λ found at the end of the proof we can choose $\lambda = 1$ to show that no solutions do exist if

$$\lambda_1(A, f) < \frac{1}{K}.$$

4. Existence of a solution

Now we deal with our existence results. Recall that we are dealing with problem

$$\begin{cases} -\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{div}(A_m(x)\nabla u^m) = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{4.16}$$

The argument will be by approximation. For $s \ge 0$, we define

$$Q_n(s) := \sum_{m=1}^{n} a_m s^m, \tag{4.17}$$

and we consider for $f \in L^q(\Omega)$, $q > \frac{N}{2}$ the unique weak solutions v of the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(A(x)\nabla v) = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,; \end{cases} \tag{4.18}$$

then we set $u_n = Q_n^{-1}(v)$ which is well defined since Q_n is strictly increasing for $s > 0$ and $Q_n(s) \to +\infty$ as s goes to infinity. Moreover it is easy to check that $v \ge 0$, so that also $u_n \ge 0$.

Therefore we have

Proposition 4.1. *Let $u_n = Q_n^{-1}(v)$ where v is the weak solution to problem (4.18). Then there exists $\overline{c} > 0$ such that*

$$\|u_n\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} + \|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \overline{c}\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}. \tag{4.19}$$

In particular, there exists a nonnegative function $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that u_n converges to u weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$ and a.e. on Ω, and $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \sigma$, where σ is defined by (1.3).

Proof. We take u_n as test function in (4.18) and we use that $v = Q_n(u_n)$. So that we have

$$\sum_{m=1}^{n} a_m \int_\Omega A(x)\nabla u_n^m \cdot \nabla u_n = \int_\Omega f u_n \,.$$

We drop al nonnegative terms but the first, and we get, using both Hölder and Sobolev inequalities

$$\|u_n\|_{H_0^1(\Omega)} \leq \frac{C}{a_1}\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}.$$

Now we choose $G_k(u_n)$ as test function in the weak formulation of (4.18). Dropping again all positive terms but the first, one obtain

$$a_1\alpha \int_\Omega |\nabla G_k(u_n)|^2 \leq \int_\Omega f G_k(u_n).$$

So that, by a standard Stampacchia type argument (see [4]) we readily have that there exists a positive c, such that

$$\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq c\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \,,$$

which completes the proof of estimate (4.19). In particular there exists $u \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ such we can extract a (not relabeled) subsequence u_n convergent to u both *a.e.* on Ω and weakly in $H_0^1(\Omega)$.

To obtain the bound with respect to σ we start reasoning as in the proof of Proposition 2.3. Recall that all but a finite number of a_m are different from zero, so, in the next argument, it will not be restrictive to suppose them *all* different from zero.

Hence, we take u_n as test function in (4.18) and we drop all the positive terms but the n-th, to get, using the previous inequality

$$a_n n \int_\Omega {u_n}^{n-1} |\nabla u_n|^2 \leq C\|f\|^2_{L^q(\Omega)}.$$

On the other hand, using Poincaré inequality and then Chebyshev inequality, we have

$$\int_\Omega {u_n}^{n-1}|\nabla u_n|^2 = \frac{4}{(n+1)^2}\int_\Omega |\nabla u_n^{\frac{n+1}{2}}|^2$$

$$\geq c_p^p \frac{4}{(n+1)^2}\int_\Omega |u_n|^{n+1} \geq c_p^p \frac{4M^{n+1}}{(n+1)^2}\mathrm{meas}(\{u_n \geq M\}),$$

for a fixed number $M > \sigma$, and where c_p is the Poincaré constant relative to Ω. Hence

$$\mathrm{meas}(\{u_n \geq M\}) \leq C\frac{(n+1)^2\|f\|^2_{L^q(\Omega)}}{na_nM^n},$$

and, using the definition of σ, the right hand side behaves as $n(\frac{\sigma}{M})^n$, which implies, using that $\sigma < M$ and taking the liminf as n goes to infinity, $u \leq M$, a.e. Due to the arbitrary choice of M we get $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \sigma$.

□

4.1. **Existence for small data.** First of all we want to prove that a solution does exist, for every $\{a_m\}$, if the size of the datum is small enough no matter of the condition (2.12) is satisfied or not (cfr. with Theorem 2.6). We have the following

Theorem 4.2. *There exists $\overline{\lambda}$ such that, if $\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)} < \overline{\lambda}$, then problem (4.16) has a weak solution u for every $\{a_m\}$ such that $\sigma > 0$. Moreover $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \sigma$.*

Proof. Let σ be defined as in (1.3). Thanks to Proposition 4.1 we know that solutions to problem (4.18) satisfy

$$\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \overline{c}\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)},$$

so we choose $\overline{\lambda}$ as

$$\overline{\lambda} = \frac{\sigma}{\overline{c}}.$$

Using again Proposition 4.1 we know that u_n converges weakly towards a function u in $H^1_0(\Omega)$ and a.e. on Ω, moreover, thanks to the choice of $\overline{\lambda}$, we have $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < \sigma$. In particular, for fixed m we have

$$\int_\Omega A(x)\nabla u_n^m \cdot \nabla\varphi \longrightarrow \int_\Omega A(x)\nabla u^m \cdot \nabla\varphi \ \text{ as } n \to +\infty,$$

for any $\varphi \in H^1_0(\Omega)$.

Moreover, we have

$$\sum_{m=1}^{n} a_m \int_\Omega A(x)\nabla u_n^m \cdot \nabla\varphi$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m m \chi_{\{1\le m\le n\}}(m) \int_\Omega u_n^{m-1} A(x)\nabla u_n \cdot \nabla\varphi,$$

Where,

$$\left| a_m m \chi_{\{1\le m\le n\}}(m) \int_\Omega u_n^{m-1} A(x)\nabla u_n \cdot \nabla\varphi \right|$$

$$\le C\beta a_m m \|u_n\|^{m-1}_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le C\beta a_m m \gamma^{m-1},$$

where C only depends on $\overline{c}$ and on the norm of φ in $H^1_0(\Omega)$, and $\gamma < \sigma$. So we can apply Lebesgue dominated convergence theorem with respect to the measure $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \delta_i$ to pass to the limit in (4.18) and we conclude. □

As a consequence of this result we can better characterize the sets of data in which we have either existence or nonexistence. As before, to simplify the exposition, we shall consider the following problem depending on the parameter λ

$$\begin{cases} -\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \operatorname{div}(A_m(x)\nabla u^m) = \lambda f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,, \end{cases} \tag{4.20}$$

with $A_m(x)$ and f a fixed function in $L^q(\Omega)$, $q > \frac{N}{2}$.

Let us define the following

$$\Lambda_f := \sup\{\lambda : \exists u \text{ and } \gamma, \text{ with } u \text{ solution of (4.20) }, \ u \le \gamma < \sigma\}$$

Notice that Λ_f is always strictly positive thanks to Theorem 4.2. Now, if

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \sigma^m < +\infty.$$

then, by Theorem 2.6, $\Lambda_f < +\infty$. On the other hand, we will see in the Section 4.2 that, if the previous condition does not hold, then $\Lambda_f = +\infty$ (i.e. Theorem 2.7). In any cases we can state the following result in which, as before, the value $\sigma = +\infty$ is allowed.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\{a_m\}$ be such that $\sigma > 0$. Then a solution to problem (4.20) does exist for any $0 < \lambda < \Lambda_f$.*

Proof. Let us fix $\lambda < \Lambda_f$. We want to prove that a solution does exist. By definition there exists a solution v of problem (4.20) with datum $\mu \in (\lambda, \Lambda_f)$ with $v \le \gamma$. We consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(A(x)\nabla\overline{Q}(u)) = \lambda f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,, \end{cases} \tag{4.21}$$

where

$$\overline{Q}(s) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m s^m & \text{if } s \le \gamma \\ \displaystyle s\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \gamma^m & \text{if } s > \gamma. \end{cases}$$

The solution u does exist since $\overline{Q}(s)$ is increasing and surjective on $\mathbb{R}^+$. Now, since $v \le \gamma$, then v turns out to solve problem (4.21) with μf as datum. Therefore, we can use $(\overline{Q}(u) - \overline{Q}(v))^+$ as test function in the problems solved by u and v respectively, and then we subtract the second from the first one to obtain, using also (2.8)

$$\alpha \int_{\{\overline{Q}(u) \ge \overline{Q}(v)\}} |\nabla(\overline{Q}(u) - \overline{Q}(v))|^2 \le 0,$$

that implies $\overline{Q}(u) \le \overline{Q}(v)$ a.e. on Ω. Thus, since $\overline{Q}$ increases, $u \le v \le \gamma$ and we conclude, since, thanks to the definition of $\overline{Q}$, this is equivalent for u to solve (4.20) . □

An interesting question related to the previous result is the following

Open Problem 4.4. What happens if $\lambda \to \Lambda_f$? Does a solution exist for problem (4.20) with datum $\Lambda_f f$? In which sense?

4.2. **Existence in the general case.** Here we complete the proof of Theorem 2.4 by giving the following

Proof of Theorem 2.7. As before, for $s \ge 0$, we define

$$Q_n(s) := \sum_{m=1}^{n} a_m s^m,$$

and we consider the weak solutions of problem (4.18) which exists, as before, since Q_n is strictly increasing for $s > 0$ and surjective on $\mathbb{R}^+$.

Using again a Stampacchia type argument (see [4]) we readily have

$$\|Q_n(u_n)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le c\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}\,,$$

for a fixed constant $c > 0$. Moreover, thanks to Proposition 4.1 we know that

$$\|u_n\|_{H^1_0(\Omega)} \leq \overline{c}\|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)},$$

and there exists $u \in H^1_0(\Omega)$ such that u_n weakly converges to u in $H^1_0(\Omega)$, $u_n \to u$ a.e. on Ω with $\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \sigma$.

To simplify the notation, let us define $\lambda \equiv \|f\|_{L^q(\Omega)}$. Moreover, since Q_n is strictly increasing we have

$$\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq Q_n^{-1}(c\lambda)\,. \tag{4.22}$$

Our aim is to prove that, for fixed f (and so λ), there exists $0 < \gamma < \sigma$ such that $Q_n^{-1}(c\lambda) \leq \gamma$ for n large enough. In fact, it is enough to choose γ such that

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \gamma^m > c\lambda\,,$$

that is possible by Abel's theorem since a_m are nonnegative real numbers, $\forall m > 0$. Since $Q_n(\gamma)$ converges to $\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m\gamma^m$, there exists $\overline{n}$ large enough such that $Q_n(\gamma) > c\lambda$ for every $n \geq \overline{n}$, and so $Q_n^{-1}(c\lambda) < \gamma$ for $n \geq \overline{n}$.

Now, thanks to (4.22), it is easy to pass to the limit and to conclude as in the proof of Theorem 4.2. □

5. Approximating sequences

In this last section we want to give some further remarks on what happens to the approximating solutions when existence does not hold.

Consider the approximating problems (4.18), that is, once we define as before $Q_n(u_n) = v$

$$\begin{cases} -\displaystyle\sum_{m=1}^{n} \operatorname{div}(A_m(x)\nabla u_n^m) = f & \text{in } \Omega \\ u_n = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,. \end{cases} \tag{5.23}$$

As we already noticed, the case $\sigma = 0$ yields trivially nonexistence by Definition 2.1, since the only possible function satisfying (2.11) is $u = 0$. We want to strenghten this fact by observing that the approximating sequences of solutions of problems (5.23) actually converges to zero as n goes to infinity. The proof of this fact being already contained in the proof of Proposition 4.1, since, for any $\delta > 0$, we got

$$\operatorname{meas}(\{u_n \geq \delta\}) \leq \frac{Cn}{\delta^n a_n} \to 0,$$

as $n \to +\infty$, an so

$$\operatorname{meas}(\{u \geq \delta\}) = 0,$$

for any $\delta > 0$. That is $u = 0$.

So let us focus on the case $\sigma > 0$ in which

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \sigma^m < +\infty \tag{5.24}$$

is in force. As pointed out in Example 3.1 of [3] (see also [1] where a finer analysis concerning singular quasilinear equations is developed) some singular problems turn out to develop *generalized solutions* obtained as limit of approximating sequences with *flat zones* of positive measure in which they are constant and equal to σ (where σ is the singular point of the problem). For the sake of exposition, let us explain what happens with a constant datum $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. If v solves

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(A(x)\nabla v) = \lambda & \text{in } \Omega \\ v = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega\,, \end{cases}$$

we consider, as before, the change of variable $v = Q_n(u_n)$ where Q_n is defined as in (4.17). It is always possible to choose λ large enough such that

$$\mathrm{meas}(\{v > K\}) > 0,$$

where K is as in (3.14). It is easy to see that, by definition, on the set $\{v > K\}$, u_n converges a.e. to σ and so the limit u of the approximating solutions turns out to have a flat zone of positive measure.

References

[1] L. Boccardo, T. Leonori, L. Orsina, F. Petitta, Quasilinear Elliptic Equations with singular quadratic growth terms, to appear.

[2] D. G. De Figueiredo, *Positive solutions of semilinear elliptic problems*. Differential Equations. Proceedings of the 1st Latin American School of Differential Equations, Held at São Paulo, Brazil, June 29-July 17, 1981. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 957/1982. Springer 1982.

[3] L. Orsina, Existence results for some elliptic equations with unbounded coefficients, Asymptot. Anal. **34** (2003), no. 3–4, 187–198.

[4] G. Stampacchia, Le problème de Dirichlet pour les équations elliptiques du seconde ordre à coefficientes discontinus, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), **15** (1965), 189–258.

[5] J. L. Vazquez, *The Porous Medium Equation*, Oxford Mathematical Monographs, 2007.

(F. Petitta) Dipartimento di Scienze di Base e Applicate per l' Ingegneria, "Sapienza", Università di Roma, Via Scarpa 16, 00161 Roma, Italy.

E-mail address: francesco.petitta@sbai.uniroma1.it